

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; claims 17-20 are newly added, no new matter is added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language.

The Office action asserts that the declaration is defective for failing to acknowledge the applicants' duty to disclose per 37 CFR 1.56. The applicants respectfully note that this assertion is incorrect. The applicants' declaration clearly acknowledges this duty. The Examiner's attention is requested to the second-to-last paragraph on page 1 of the applicants' declaration.

The Office action rejects claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tanada (USPA 2002/0047550). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 claims a method of improving the output uniformity of a display device that includes detecting an emitted brightness of at least one pixel of display device via an external detection system that is substantially independent of the display device.

In like manner, claim 13 claims a system that includes a detection system that is substantially independent of a display device and configured to communicate information based on the emitted brightness to the display device to facilitate improvement of output brightness uniformity.

Similarly, claim 15 claims a display device that receives information based on an emitted brightness of one or more pixels of the display device from an external detector that is independent of the display device.

Tanada does not teach a detection system that is substantially independent of the display device from which the output brightness is being detected.

Tanada teaches a display device that includes a light-detector within each light-emitting pixel. Tanada teaches an embodiment (FIG. 13) wherein the light-detection elements are located on a different substrate than the structure that forms the light-emitting elements, but this separate/external light-detecting structure still includes a light-detecting element corresponding to each light-emitting element.

Tanada's calibration technique requires a one-to-one correspondence between light-emitting elements and light-detecting elements, and thus Tanada's separate detector structure cannot be said to be independent of the display device, as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tanada.

The Office action rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanada and Hack et al. (USPA 2002/0030647, hereinafter Hack). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 16 is dependent upon claim 13. In this rejection, the Office action relies upon Tanada for teaching the elements of claim 13. As noted above, Tanada fails to teach the elements of claim 13. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tanada and Hack.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001